

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA**

KAREY DAVID COLEMAN,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	1:13-cv-170-TWP-DKL
)	
J. EVERETT LIGHT CAREER)	
CENTER,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

Entry Directing Further Proceedings

I.

The clerk shall include a copy of the complaint with the plaintiff's copy of this Entry.

The request to proceed *in forma pauperis* [Dkt. 2] is **granted**.

II.

A.

A district court possesses only the jurisdiction conferred to it by Congress. See *South Carolina v. Katzenbach*, 383 U.S. 301 (1966).

Congress has conferred subject matter jurisdiction on the district courts only in cases that raise a federal question and cases in which there is diversity of citizenship among the parties. See 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331-32.

Smart v. Local 702 Intern. Broth. of Elec. Workers, 562 F.3d 798, 802 (7th Cir. 2009).

Additionally, "[a] complaint must always . . . allege enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face." *Limestone Development Corp. v. Village of Lemont, Ill.*, 520 F.3d 797, 803 (7th Cir. 2008) (quoting *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007)). A claim has facial plausibility when the

plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 129 S. Ct. 1937, 1949 (2009).

B.


The plaintiff shall have **through February 20, 2013**, in which to supplement his complaint by (1) setting forth the basis of this court’s jurisdiction over his claim(s), and (2) setting forth his claim(s) with facial plausibility as defined above.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: 02/07/2013

Distribution:

Karey David Coleman
189 South Sunblest
Fishers, IN 46038


Hon. Tanya Walton Pratt, Judge
United States District Court
Southern District of Indiana